

**Independent Examination Of The Kings Lynn &
West Norfolk Local Plan: Site Allocations And
Development Management Policies 2011 -2026
(SADMP)**

For Land at

Saw Mill Road, Brancaster

BRAN1/G13.1 – SUPPORT

ISSUE 12

For the

Warner Family

RESPONDENT REFERENCE NO. 835 – Jamie Bird

HEARING SESSION 14TH JULY 2015 – 14:00

19 June 2015

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This statement should be read in conjunction with the reports and submissions made at the Preferred Options for a Detailed Policies and Sites Plan DPD and Site Allocations and Detailed Management Policies Plan Consultation Response Feb 2015 (SADMP), these for record were:
- Detailed Policies and Site Response BRAN1 Sept 2013
 - Brancaster MRA SK01 & SK02 Feasibility Layout
 - JBA Landscape Statement Landscape Assessment Sept 2013
 - Engineering & Utilities Assessment - Plandescil Consulting Engineers
 - Phase 1 Habitats Survey - TORC Ecology August 2013
 - Phase 2 Bat & Reptile Survey - TORC Ecology September 2013
 - Addendum Report – Phase 2 Ecology Survey (Bats, reptiles and breeding birds) July 2014 – further recommendations for ecology enhancement and mitigation
 - Plan indicating the extent of existing footpaths in the immediate vicinity of BRAN1/G.13.
- 1.2 Accompanying this submission in Appendix A is a report by Kingdom TP report addressing the proximity of the site to adjoining facilities along with illustrations demonstrating existing vehicular and pedestrian connectivity and recommendations for enhancement secured through the development management process.
- 1.3 This submission supports the allocation of the land under G13.1 and is prepared to address the Inspectors Issues and Questions and further address the concerns raised by the Parish Council.

Question

12.1 Is there evidence that any of the following proposed residential development sites in Brancaster/Burnham Deepdale are not justified, sustainable, viable, available or deliverable:

- *East of Mill Road (G13.1)*

If such evidence exists what alternatives are available and have they been satisfactorily considered by the Council?

1.4 Summary and points raised by the Parish Council:

The proposed allocation at 13.1, Sawmill Road, Brancaster does not provide for safe means of access to local facilities, should be of single storey in scale and does not comply with the Village Design Statement.

2.0 RESPONSE to Inspectors Question:

- 2.1 The inspector has asked whether the site is considered to be *justified, sustainable, viable, available and deliverable*.
- 2.2 **Justified** - It is considered the site is the most appropriate selection for development as it delivers on key aims of the plan and meets with the adopted Core Strategy, including the methodology for distributing development. The proposed allocation can meet with the proposed allocation criteria.
- 2.3 **Sustainable** - The Council have concluded through their preferred method for distributing development and the settlement hierarchy that Brancaster is a sustainable settlement and identified as a Key Rural Service Centre. Brancaster given its proximity with Brancaster Staithe and Burnham Deepdale hold a 'joint' role lending mutual support in the provision of services, which include a School, pub/restaurant, post office, convenience store, village hall, churches and numerous small retail outlets and businesses. In the case of G13.1 the school, pub, church, beach, golf course, nature reserves and tourism related facilities are within walking distance. Other facilities are within a short vehicular trip as is much of rural west Norfolk. The Coast hopper bus service has an informal bus stop to the west of the junction of Mill Road/A149 and a formal stop to the south of the A149 approx 75m from the same junction. See the attached Kingdom TP report in Appendix 1.
- 2.4 **Viable** - G13.1 is a viable proposition and involves no 'exceptional' development costs. Services are readily available (as determined by the Plandescil submission) and as the site is Greenfield no significant costs are expected in relation to foundation or 'below ground' infrastructure. The access proposed to the site can be delivered independently of Sawmill Road, however further discussion with the residents of Sawmill Road could see the delivery and use of this existing access (upgraded and improved for the benefit of all) in the longer term. In short either access can be delivered with third party involvement and neither are cost prohibitive.
- 2.5 **Available** - The land has been put forward for development by the landowners and expressions of interest received from developers and builders and thus the availability of the land is without question. The landowners have a strong, longstanding local connection and wish to see the site developed sensitively, with good design and that endeavours to meet the aims of the as yet, unadopted Neighbourhood Plan of Brancaster Parish.
- 2.6 **Deliverable** - The land is capable of being delivered within the first five years of being allocated and it is the landowners intentions to gain planning approval very soon after the land is allocated.

3.0 RESPONSE to Objector/Parish Council Statement:

- 3.1 The parish council have raised concern about the allocation 13.1, although noting they do not object to the principle of development.
- 3.2 The main issues arising from their consultation response are:
1. Safe walking/pedestrian links to local facilities and the school
 2. No reference to the Village Design Statement (Neighbourhood Plan)
 3. Preference for single storey development
- 3.3 The report appended to this submission describes access to local facilities to the school and the assertion that the junction of Mill Road and A149 has the highest accident record of any junction between Hunstanton and Wells. Whilst we respect the local knowledge upon which the comment is made, factually this is inaccurate and the attached report demonstrates that:
1. Footpath access to local facilities is available, albeit crossing in places is necessary
 2. The accident record of this junction is not high and the junction is considered safe.
 3. No objection from Norfolk County Highway Authority
- 3.4 However we would be happy for wording in the allocation to include
- “ The provision of a Travel Plan demonstrating pedestrian and vehicular connectivity to key local facilities developed in conjunction with the Parish Council and County Highways Authority and the adoption of any key recommendations and improvements therein ”***
- 3.5 In response to the Parish Councils points 2 and 3 above, the landowners assert the following:
- We are happy to propose that the dwellings seek to comply with the Village Design Statement/Neighbourhood Plan *if and when adopted*
 - Allocation criteria in Policy 13.1 requires the development to have regard to the impact on the landscape and AONB and proposes that a high quality landscape scheme is incorporated. The assumption is the dwellings will respect local character and the allocation wording proposes the scale and massing take the above into account. We feel the wording is sufficient, any restriction on the massing or scale in the wording of the allocation would prevent flexibility in accommodation and dwelling mix being provided. We feel this is a development management issue that can be suitably addressed at the point of planning application.

4.0 Conclusions

- 4.1 Site BRAN1/G13.1 is considered sound.
- 4.2 This proposal is justified, sustainable, effective, consistent, achievable, available and deliverable and the owners of BRAN1/G13.1 support the proposed allocation of this land.
- 4.3 The landowners support additional provisions in the allocation wording along the lines of:
1. *“ The provision of a Travel Plan demonstrating pedestrian and vehicular connectivity to key local facilities developed in conjunction with the Parish Council and County Highways Authority and the adoption of any key recommendations and improvements therein”*
 2. *“The development will endeavour to comply with the Village Design Statement and Brancaster Neighbourhood Plan if adopted.”*
- 4.4 **Test of Soundness**
- 4.5 **What part of the plan is unsound?**
- 4.6 The submitted SADMP document is considered sound, though amendments are suggested above to the allocation wording which would meet with the concerns expressed by the Parish Council and only serve to enhance the sites equation to the Councils Core Strategy and Sustainability Assessment.
- 4.7 **Positively Prepared**
- 4.8 The allocation of the site will be rural housing need as identified in the SADMP and therefore is considered to be positively prepared. Issues identified can be overcome and easily resolved.
- 4.9 **Justified**
- 4.10 The plan is considered to be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.
- 4.11 **Effective**
- 4.12 The land is deliverable in years 0-5 of the plan and there are no barriers to its delivery.

4.13 Consistent with the NPPF

4.14 The plan is considered to be consistent with the NPPF and delivers sustainable development to a Key Rural Service Centre. Any negative impacts of the development have been adequately and appropriately considered and capable of being overcome and resolved.

4.15 The SADMP is based on the Councils up to date evidence base and can be delivered.

4.16 How can the Plan be made sound?

4.17 A minor modification would be accepted which incorporated the requirement for the development to accord with the Brancaster Village Design Statement and the production of Travel Plan, produced in conjunction with key stakeholders to deliver any recommendations required to further enhance green travel and pedestrian and cycle accessibility.

Word Count: 1493

APPENDIX A